

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 4, and 9 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 9-14 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 4, and 9 are the independent claims.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

In the Office Action at page 3, claims 1-2, 4-5, 9, 11 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,486,686 to Zdybel, Jr. et al. in view of BarCode1 and in further view of newly-cited U.S. Patent No. 5,214,755 to Mason. All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite "determining the additional material linked with the direct-reading material to allocate, with reference to a link management database storing a link between direct-reading material and additional material, wherein the allocation is carried out based on a total space for the direct-reading material and the additional material." Independent claims 4 and 9 have been amended to recite similar features. Support for these amendments to independent claims 1, 4, and 9 can be found in the originally filed Specification, at least at page 15, line 32 through page 16, line 35. Thus, according to amended independent claims 1, 4, and 9, both the direct-reading material and the additional material will be disposed in proximity to one another with the correspondence relationship kept therebetween. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Zdybel, Jr. et al., BarCode1, nor Mason teach or suggest at least this feature of amended independent claims 1, 4, and 9.

The Office Action acknowledges that neither Zdybel, Jr. et al. nor BarCode1 teach or suggest "determining a specific way of allocating the additional material with respect to relevant direct-reading material based on the stored data", as recited in independent claim 1. Independent claims 4 and 9 recite similar features. The Office Action relies upon Mason to teach this feature. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Mason at col. 4, lines 20-63, as cited by the Office Action, merely teaches the arrangement of direct-reading material. Further, the requirements for the arrangement of direct-reading material differ from those for the arrangement of additional materials. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Mason fails to teach or suggest the allocation of "additional material with respect to relevant direct-reading material based on the stored data", as recited in independent claims 1, 4, and 9."

Applicant respectfully submits that Zdybel, Jr et al., BarCode1, and Mason, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 4, and 9, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom. Accordingly, without

conceding the propriety of the combination, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 4, and 9, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are, therefore, in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action at page 10, claims 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zdybel in view of BarCode1, and in further view of Mason, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,938,727 to Ikeda. All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Ikeda is relied upon only to teach "a barcode representing a URL as well as the URL itself are printed side by side on a printed medium such as a magazine advertisement or newspaper insert. When a user who has found an interesting object in the printed medium has the affixed barcode scanned by a scanner, software incorporated into the user's personal computer operates to convert the barcode to a URL so as to have a WWW client software, such as Mosaic and Netscape Navigator, recognize it, whereby a specified homepage is instantaneously accessed and displayed on the screen and the desired information is obtained" (Office Action at page 10). Applicant respectfully submits that Ikeda fails to cure the deficiencies of Mason noted above with respect to independent claims 1, 4, and 9. Accordingly, without conceding the propriety of the asserted combination, Applicant respectfully submits that Zdybel Jr., et al., BarCode1, Mason, and Ikeda, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of dependent claims 10 and 12. Thus, claims 10 and 12 are in condition for allowance.

### **Conclusion**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.


Serial No. 09/584,966

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 19 July 2006

By:   
Allison Olenginski  
Registration No. 55,509

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501